

Remarks

Prior to this communication, claims 68 – 103 were pending. By this response, claims 75, 80, and 95 have been amended; and claims 88 – 94, and 96 have been cancelled.

Reconsideration and examination in view of the following remarks are respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 68 – 88 and 94 – 103 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,643,086 (“Alcorn”).

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 68 recites a system for verifying at least one digital medium in a gaming machine that includes, among other things, “receives from said gaming machine an outcome of said verification algorithm.”

Alcorn does not teach or suggest, among other things, “receives from said gaming machine an outcome of said verification algorithm,” as recited in claim 68. Particularly, the passages cited in the Action are recited below:

The casino game data set and a unique signature are stored in a mass storage device, which may comprise a read only unit or a read/write unit and which may be physically located either within the casino game console or remotely located and linked to the casino game console over a suitable network. (Col. 2, ll. 27 – 32.)

Each time a casino game data set is transferred from the mass storage device to the main memory of the system, the authentication routine is run. The authentication routine can also be run automatically on a periodic basis, or on demand – either locally by means of an operator switch mounted in the game console or remotely via a network. Consequently, the authenticity of the data set can be automatically checked whenever the transfer occurs and at other appropriate times. (Col. 3, ll. 13 – 21.)

Also, the mass storage unit need not be physically located within the game console along with the other elements depicted in FIG. 1: the mass storage unit may be located remotely from the game console and coupled thereto by means of an appropriate

network, such as an ethernet, an RS232 link, or some other network link. This latter alternate arrangement is indicated by the inclusion of a network subsystem 21 of appropriate configuration and functional characteristics, which may have ethernet, RS232 serial, or other network compatibility. (Col. 6, ll. 47 – 56.)

Further, FIG. 4 and FIG. 5 simply illustrate, respectively, how an encrypted data set signature is generated, and the authentication routine. Even if Applicant were to construe the claimed authentication agent to include the mass storage unit as indicated in the Action, Alcorn does not teach or suggest, among other things, that the mass storage unit receives anything from the casino game console. As such, Alcorn does not anticipate claim 68 with respect to the limitation “receives from said gaming machine an outcome of said verification algorithm.” Therefore, claim 68 is allowable.

Claims 69 – 74 are dependent from claim 68, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons for allowance set forth above with respect to claim 68.

Amended claim 75 recites a “method for verifying at least one digital medium” that includes, among other things, “receiving said outcome from said gaming machine.”

For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 68, Alcorn does not anticipate the limitation “receiving said outcome from said gaming machine” of claim 75. As such, claim 75 is allowable. Claims 76 – 78 depend from claim 75, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claim 79 recites a gaming device that includes, among other things, “an apparatus for loading data external from said gaming machine to said storage device, said apparatus transmitting an authentication agent.”

For at least the reasons set forth above, claim 79 is allowable.

Amended claim 80 recites a method for presenting at least one game to a player at a gaming machine that includes, among other things, “receiving said outcome from said gaming machine.” For at least the reasons set forth above, claim 80 and dependent claims 81 – 87 are allowable.

Claims 88 – 94 have been cancelled. The rejections are deemed moot.

Amended claim 95 recites a system for monitoring a gaming machine that includes, among other things, “receive from said gaming machine an outcome of said verification algorithm.” For at least the reasons set forth above, claim 95 and dependent claims 97 – 103 are allowable.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 89 – 93 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alcorn in view of European Patent Application No. 0464811A2 (“Fukushima”).

Claims 89 – 93 have been cancelled.

The rejections are thus deemed moot.

CONCLUSION

Entry of the Amendment and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. The undersigned is available for telephone consultation at any time during normal business hours.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 7, 2008

By: /Lawrence M. Jarvis/
Lawrence M. Jarvis
Reg. No. 27,341
Attorney for Applicants

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60661
Phone: (312) 775-8000
Fax: (312) 775-8100